

Appl. No. 10/708,158  
Response dated 12/27/2005  
Reply to Office Action of 6/27/2005

**AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS**

Please delete existing Fig. 8A and substitute the attached drawing as new Fig. 13. The attached drawing sheet, new Fig. 13, is a renumbered copy of Fig. 8A. This figure number change has been requested by the Examiner since previously there was no Fig. 13, leaving a gap between Figs. 12 & 14.

Attachment: New Drawing Sheet for Fig. 13

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **Objections to Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the lack of a Fig. 13. Applicant has deleted Fig. 8A and renumbered it as Fig. 13. Hence, there is no gap in the numbered figures as amended. The specification has been amended to delete the description of Fig. 8A and add the description for Fig. 13 that was previously associated with Fig. 8A. The specification has further been amended to refer to Fig. 13 instead of Fig. 8A in the detailed description. There are no further references to Fig. 8A.

#### **Objections to the Specification**


The Examiner has objected to the description of the parent application, which has matured into a patent. The specification has been amended to include the U.S. patent serial number associated with the parent application.

#### **Objections to the Claims**

Claims 47, 52, 53 and 58 have been rejected by the Examiner under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Independent claims 47 and 53 have been amended to incorporate limitations from the present application thereby rendering the obviousness rejection moot. As claims 52 and 58 depend on claims 47 and 53 respectively, the objections to these claims are likewise rendered moot.

In addition, claims 48-51 and claims 54-57 have been objected to by the Examiner as being dependent on a rejected base claim (i.e., the double patent rejected base claims 47 and 53). Since the independent claims that these claims depend on have been amended, the objections to these claims is likewise moot.

The Examiner has stated that claims 29-46 are allowable. Applicant believes that since all other claims now incorporate the limitations found in independent claim 29, that all claims in the application are now in condition for allowance. As this application has been declared SPECIAL, Applicant requests expedited allowance.





App. No. 10/708,158  
Response dated 12/27/2005  
Reply to Office Action of 6/27/2005

## CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner differs in this conclusion, the Examiner is hereby requested to contact Applicant's representative for purposes of a telephone interview at the number listed below before any action (other than an allowance) is initiated.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joseph J. Mayo, Reg. No.: 53,288  
of THE DALYNA LAW GROUP, P.C.  
P. (866) 221-6964  
F. (858) 777-5425

<b>Correspondence Info:</b>  Customer Number  <b>36067</b>	<b><i>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING or TRANSMISSION</i></b>  <i>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on <u>December 27, 2005</u> to (571)273-8300 or is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.</i>
	Signature  Date: December 27, 2005 Name: Joseph J. Mayo